

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated July 31, 2007 (hereinafter “Office Action”), in which the Examiner:) acknowledged the withdrawal of claims 1-3 and the election of claims 4-19; and 2) rejected claims 4-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Scott (U.S. Pat. No. 6,078,805, hereinafter “Scott”). With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 4, 9, 10 and 12. Based upon the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance.

In the rejection of Independent claims 4 and 12 as allegedly anticipated by Scott, the Examiner stated, among other things, that “Scott teaches a mobile communications provision method in a mobile communications system having at least two wireless networks with different mobile switch center (‘MSC’) communication protocols (see Abstract and column 9, lines 20-43)...” Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 3. Applicants respectfully note that although Scott does describe multiple communication networks (e.g., cellular and personal communication service (PCS) networks; see Scott, col. 2, lines 6-12), Scott only briefly addresses the communication protocol used by an MSC to communicate with a home location register (HLR). Specifically, Scott teaches that, “In the instant embodiment, queries and responses between the mobility switch 325 and HLR 330 are transmitted using an IS41 protocol, a protocol commonly used in cellular systems. However, those of ordinary skill will recognize that equivalent protocols may be used as well.” Scott, col. 13, lines 61-65. Thus, Scott teaches away from the use of the native protocol of the wireless network of the MSC (e.g., cellular or PCS) to communicate with the HLR, and instead teaches the use of a separate, distinct protocol for communications between the MSC and the HLR (e.g., IS41).

Applicants respectfully note that independent claim 1, as amended, requires “the serving MSC communicating with the ULSR according to a first communication protocol associated with the serving MSC; and a second MSC communicating with the ULSR according to a second communication protocol associated with the second MSC, the first communication protocol being different from the second communication protocol.” Independent claim 12, as amended,

similarly requires “wherein the ULSR communicates with the MSCs of each of the wireless networks in the set of wireless networks according to the protocol of each MSC.” Support for these amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0012-0013], [0025], [0027-0030], [0033] and [0037] of the subject application. Applicants respectfully submit that Scott does not teach or even suggest MSCs that each use their own, distinct protocol to communicate with the ULSR. Scott thus does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the amended claims, and thus does not anticipate either claim. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 4 and 12, as well as those claims that respectively depend upon them, are all in condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicants respectfully note that the claim has been amended to include limitations similar to those of amended independent claim 4. Support for these amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0012-0013], [0025], [0027-0030], [0033] and [0037] of the subject application. Further, dependent claim 10 has been amended for consistency with the amendments to independent claim 9. For at least the same reasons as those presented with regard to claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, as amended, as well as those claims that depend upon it, are all in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents

**Appl. No. 10/781,593
Resp. dated November 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2007**

accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roberto de Leon/

Roberto de Leon
PTO Reg. No. 58,967
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400